

WORK MEETING AGENDA OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF LAYTON, UTAH

PUBLIC NOTICE is hereby given that the City Council of Layton, Utah, will hold a regular public meeting in the Council Conference Room in the City Center Building, 437 North Wasatch Drive, Layton, Utah, commencing at **5:30 PM on December 18, 2014.**

Item:

1. Accept the Proposal for an Agreement between Layton City and Think Architecture - Landscape Architectural Services for Layton City's Neighborhood Park - Resolution 14-75 - 3500 North 2100 East

2. Amend the Consolidated Fee Schedule - Ordinance 14-29

3. Final Approval Extension Request – Jensen Homestead Subdivision – Approximately 2700 East Gentile Street

4. Final Approval Commercial Plat – Castlebrook Commercial Subdivision – 930 West Antelope Drive

5. Encourage the State of Utah to Address Comprehensive Transportation Funding - Resolution 14-77

6. Amend Title 5, Chapter 5.29 and Title 12, Chapter 12.04 Redefining the Term "Junk Dealer" and Providing Prohibition of Certain Activities on Public Property - Ordinance 14-26

7. Amend Title 19 (Zoning), Chapter 19.02, Section 19.02.020 Definitions – Ordinance 14-30

In the event of an absence of a full quorum, agenda items will be continued to the next regularly scheduled meeting.

This meeting may involve the use of electronic communications for some of the members of the public body. The anchor location for the meeting shall be the Layton City Council Chambers, 437 North Wasatch Drive, Layton City. Members at remote locations may be connected to the meeting telephonically.

Notice is hereby given that by motion of the Layton City Council, pursuant to Title 52, Chapter 4 of the Utah Code, the City Council may vote to hold a closed meeting for any of the purposes identified in that Chapter.

Date: _____ **By:** _____
Thieda Wellman, City Recorder

LAYTON CITY does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age or disability in the employment or the provision of services. If you are planning to attend this public meeting and, due to a disability, need assistance in understanding or participating in the meeting, please notify Layton City eight or more hours in advance of the meeting. Please contact Kiley Day at 437 North Wasatch Drive, Layton, Utah 84041, 801.336.3825 or 801.336.3820.

**LAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET**

Item Number: 1.

Subject:

Accept the Proposal for an Agreement between Layton City and Think Architecture - Landscape Architectural Services for Layton City's Neighborhood Park - Resolution 14-75 - 3500 North 2100 East

Background:

Layton City proposes to build a neighborhood park at 3500 North 2100 East. A Request for Proposal (RFP) for architectural services that included: preliminary design, design development, construction documentation and construction supervision services was distributed to all interested firms. Twelve landscape architectural firms responded to the RFP by turning in a proposal and sealed fee.

The proposals were evaluated and scored by eight individuals using predetermined weighted scoring criteria. The proposals were evaluated for four general categories, Technical Ability (10%), Experience on Similar Projects (30%), Understanding of the Scope of Work (15%) and Ability to Provide Construction Supervision (5%). Think Architecture received the highest proposal score of 56.6 out of 60 possible points in the proposal evaluation.

Once the proposal's evaluation was complete the fee proposals were opened. Fees were valued at 40% of the overall score. Each firm's fee was given a numeric score based on their relative placement within the range of fees provided by each firm. Proposed fees for this project ranged from a low of \$50,000 to a high of \$118,803. Think Architecture's fee of \$65,000 received a numeric score of 30.8 out of 40 possible points.

The combination of a proposal score of 56.6 and a fee score of 30.8 gave Think Architecture the highest overall score of 87.3 points out of 100 possible. The top four firms were interviewed and at the conclusion of the interviews Think Architecture was chosen for this project.

The complete scoring matrix will be available for review at Council Work Meeting.

Alternatives:

Alternatives are to 1) Adopt Resolution 14-75 approving the proposal for an agreement between Layton City and Think Architecture for landscape architectural services for Layton City's Neighborhood Park; 2) Adopt Resolution 14-75 with any amendments the Council deems appropriate; or 3) Not adopt Resolution 14-75 and remand to Staff with directions.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Council adopt Resolution 14-75 approving the proposal for an agreement between Layton City and Think Architecture for landscape architectural services for Layton City's Neighborhood Park.

**LAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET**

Item Number: 2.

Subject:

Amend the Consolidated Fee Schedule - Ordinance 14-29

Background:

Layton City has consolidated most fees and charges into one place within the Municipal Code, which is adopted and amended by ordinance. As a result of a comprehensive staff review of the False Fire Alarm Fees, the following changes are proposed:

Alarms: Responsible Party Non-Response Fee

Current: \$25

Proposed: \$100 (for Commercial/Non-Residential)

The proposed changes separate Residential and Commercial/Non-Residential Fees. Under the current fee structure it is less expensive for a business to pay \$25 than respond to the alarm as required. Therefore, Staff proposes a new Commercial/Non-Residential fee to be \$100. Residential fees would remain the same at \$25.

Commercial/Non-Residential False Alarm Fees

Current: \$50, \$75, \$100

Proposed: \$250, \$350, \$450

Current fees that are charged for the third, fourth, and fifth false alarm per quarter are appropriate for residential alarms. However, the fees for a Commercial False Alarm are insufficient to persuade a business owner to repair their alarm system. The purpose of these revised fees is to motivate the business/building owner to repair and maintain their alarm system. The proposed fee amount is derived from the Fire Standby Services Fee for special events that utilize a fire engine with four-person company. This covers the cost of a staffed engine to respond, investigate, and help correct the immediate problem with the system with the fee increasing by \$100 for each additional false alarm. The incremental increases are to further motivate the owner to correct the problem long-term.

Alternatives:

Alternatives are to 1) Adopt Ordinance 14-29 amending the Consolidated Fee Schedule as proposed; 2) Adopt Ordinance 14-29 with any amendments the Council deems appropriate; or 3) Not adopt Ordinance 14-29 and remand to Staff with directions.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Council adopt Ordinance 14-29 amending the Consolidated Fee Schedule as proposed.

**LAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET**

Item Number: 3.

Subject:

Final Approval Extension Request – Jensen Homestead Subdivision – Approximately 2700 East Gentile Street

Background:

On November 25, 2013, the Zoning Administrator granted a one-year final approval extension to December 6, 2014, for the Jensen Homestead Subdivision. On December 5, 2014, an additional one-year extension was requested. Per Title 18, Chapter 18.16 Section 18.16.040 of the City Code, the Zoning Administrator may grant a single one-year final approval extension. Any further extensions must be granted by the Council.

The attorney for Gwen Andersen, the property owner of Lot 1 of this subdivision, has requested an additional final approval extension of the Jensen Homestead Subdivision. Ms. Andersen is presently pursuing a lawsuit within the prior owner's bankruptcy to make it possible to complete the necessary requirements to record the Jensen Homestead Subdivision plat. This property was not properly subdivided and all requirements for recording had not been completed before the title was transferred to Ms. Andersen.

Alternatives:

Alternatives are to 1) Grant final approval extension request for the Jensen Homestead Subdivision to December 6, 2015, for good cause; or 2) Deny final approval extension request for the Jensen Homestead Subdivision.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Council grant final approval extension request for the Jensen Homestead Subdivision to December 6, 2015, for good cause.

**LAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET**

Item Number: 4.

Subject:

Final Approval Commercial Plat – Castlebrook Commercial Subdivision – 930 West Antelope Drive

Background:

The applicant, Elliott Smith, is requesting approval for the Castlebrook Commercial Subdivision. The proposal is to create three separate lots with each lot meeting the zoning requirement of being greater than 20,000 square feet. Lot 1 is planned to have a retail building for a single user at this time. Lot 2 is for the future Popeye’s Chicken fast food use that has already received conditional use approval. Lot 3 is planned to have a retail building that will have two separate restaurant users with Pizza Rev and Moe’s.

The plat also dedicates 13.67 feet of street right of way to Layton City for Antelope Drive.

Alternatives:

Alternatives are to 1) Grant commercial plat approval for Castlebrook Commercial Subdivision subject to meeting all Staff requirements as outlined in Staff memorandums; or 2) Deny granting commercial plat approval.

Recommendation:

On November 25, 2014, the Planning Commission unanimously recommended the Council grant commercial plat approval to Castlebrook Commercial Subdivision subject to meeting all Staff requirements as outlined in Staff memorandums.

Staff supports the recommendation of the Planning Commission.

**LAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET**

Item Number: 5.

Subject:

Encourage the State of Utah to Address Comprehensive Transportation Funding - Resolution 14-77

Background:

A safe and efficient transportation system creates the foundation for economic growth and improved quality of life. A core responsibility of State and local government is the creation and maintenance of transportation infrastructure. Utah's population is expected to grow by one million residents by 2040. Residents of Utah demand new comprehensive transportation options such as bike lanes, multi-use paths, off-road trails and transit in addition to the traditional roads. Research from the Utah Department of Transportation indicates that road maintenance efforts save cities from road rehabilitation that costs six times as much as maintenance, and saves cities from road reconstruction that costs ten times as much as maintenance. Investing in transportation results in tremendous economic development return for both municipalities and the State. Also, improving comprehensive transportation in Utah will reduce private vehicle usage which will in turn lead to improved air quality. Poor air quality discourages economic development, business recruitment and tourism visits, and contributes to asthma and other health ailments. Nearly 57% of Utah adults are overweight, approximately 200,000 Utahns have diabetes. Diabetes and obesity related health care costs in Utah exceed \$1 billion. Investing in safe and connected trails, bike lanes, sidewalks, and multi-use paths will encourage Utahns to be more active, spend more time with their families via active transportation, and result in improved personal and community health. The current motor fuel tax of 24.5 cents and 1% local option sales tax are insufficient to satisfy current and future transportation needs.

Utah has led the nation in creating a Unified Transportation Plan to address these comprehensive transportation and quality of life issues and the City now asks the State and local governments to work together to find comprehensive funding solutions that will address transportation, economic development, air quality and health needs.

Alternatives:

Alternatives are to 1) Adopt Resolution 14-77 encouraging the State of Utah to address comprehensive transportation funding; 2) Adopt Resolution 14-77 with any amendments the Council deems appropriate; or 3) Not adopt Resolution 14-77 and remand to Staff with directions.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Council adopt Resolution 14-77 encouraging the State of Utah to address comprehensive transportation funding.

**LAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET**

Item Number: 6.

Subject:

Amend Title 5, Chapter 5.29 and Title 12, Chapter 12.04 Redefining the Term "Junk Dealer" and Providing Prohibition of Certain Activities on Public Property - Ordinance 14-26

Background:

There has been a growing practice by area Junk Dealers to set up business on a public street or in a public right-of-way. The City has not had adequate provisions in its ordinances to prohibit such practices. The acquisition, purchase, or sale of scrap metal and other secondary or discarded items on public property presents a safety risk and is a nuisance when located in the public right-of-way or outside of those areas where such activities are permitted under the City's zoning code. This ordinance would redefine the term "Junk Dealer" and provide express prohibition of certain activities on public property.

Alternatives:

Alternatives are to 1) Adopt Ordinance 14-26 amending Title 5, Chapter 5.29 and Title 12, Chapter 12.04 redefining the term "Junk Dealer" and providing prohibition of certain activities on public property; 2) Adopt Ordinance 14-26 with any amendments the Council deems appropriate; or 3) Not adopt Ordinance 14-26 and remand to Staff with directions.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Council adopt Ordinance 14-26 amending Title 5, Chapter 5.29 and Title 12, Chapter 12.04 redefining the term "Junk Dealer" and providing prohibition of certain activities on public property.

**LAYTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET**

Item Number: 7.

Subject:

Amend –Title 19 (Zoning), Chapter 19.02, Section 19.02.020 Definitions – Ordinance 14-30

Background:

There has been a growing practice for junk dealers to occupy and run their business of junk dealing on public streets and in zones where junk dealing is not allowed. Currently, there are not adequate provisions in Title 19 to properly prohibit junk dealers from conducting business on a public street. There is a safety risk to the public when junk dealer businesses are trying to acquire, purchase or sell scrap metal or other discarded objects on a public street. It also becomes a nuisance within the public street or outside zoned areas that allow for junk dealers.

In Title 19, Chapter 19.02, Section 19.02.020, entitled Definitions, the definition of a “junk dealer” has been added to provide clarity for Staff and the public when addressing a suitable location for a junk dealer.

Alternatives:

Alternatives are to 1) Approve Ordinance 14-30 amending Title 19, Chapter 19.02, Section 19.02.020 defining a junk dealer; 2) Approve Ordinance 14-30 with corrections or additions; or 3) Not Adopt Ordinance 14-30.

Recommendation:

On December 9, 2014, the Planning Commission forwarded a positive recommendation to the Council to approve Ordinance 14-30 amending Title 19, Chapter 19.02, Section 19.02.020 defining a junk dealer.

Staff supports the recommendation of the Planning Commission.